RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 05 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Editorial revisions have been made in claims 1, 6 and 8-17. New claim 18 has been added. The revisions and the new claim are generally supported by the original disclosure. Claims 1, 6 and 8-17 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 6 and 8-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low et al. (US 6,243,443) in view of Kelly (US 6,594,254). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 requires assigning to an online computer an FDCA that comprises an online number including three parts: 1) a digital number of an established network site, 2) a telephone number comprising a country code designating the country where a user of the online computer is located, an area code designating the area where the user is located, and a telephone number of the user, and 3) a category number including a digital number for uniformly demarcating a business category. The present method provides a simple and alternative manner to help the online computers in a network identify each other by allowing each assigned address of an online computer to be unique (see, e.g., paragraph [0009] of the present specification). More specifically, for example, instead of assigning an online computer with a specific IP address, a full digital code address, e.g., 8888008621625720471, including an online number 8888, a telephone number 00862162572047 and a category number 1 may be assigned to be an alternative identifier to identify an online computer and to help the online computers in the network to identify each other via the network (see, e.g., paragraph [0011] of the present specification).

Low et al. do not disclose or suggest assigning to an online computer an FDCA that comprises three parts: 1) an online number including a digital number of an established network site, 2) a telephone number comprising a country code designating the country where a user of the online computer is located, an area code designating the area where the user is located, and a telephone number of the user, and 3) a category number including a digital number for uniformly demarcating a business category, as

recited in claim 1. In fact, Low et al. merely discuss a content code comprising a service designator as characteristic of a content-item retrieval request and a telephone number, without disclosing a country code or an area code (see Low et al. col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 to col. 12, line 3). The present online number is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Low et al. Nor is a category number that is required by claim 1 disclosed or suggested in Low et al. (see Low et al., col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63).

Moreover, Low et al. discuss a method of making content resources available to a telephone network user by assigning a content code as an identification number to a content resource. The content codes do not correspond to online computers as recited in claim 1. Rather, a content code in Low et al. corresponds to a content resource, e.g., text message that can be converted to speech by a text-to-voice converter resource, a digitized speech file, etc. See Low et al., col. 10, lines 25-36. In addition, the Low et al. content code is converted at a service switch point (SSP) to a URI according to a predetermined convention between the SSP and the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) user before the request of the content code being processed on the Internet. This is completely distinct from the present invention required by claim 1, which is a full digital code address that is to help the online computers in a network identify each other via a network.

In addition, the URI of a content resource of a server discussed at page 2 of the Office Action mailed November 3, 2006 is "Universal Resource Identifier." It is an identifier for positioning an online resource, e.g., an HTML document, image, video, program, rather than an online computer as required by claim 1. Generally, a URI includes 1) a mechanism for nominating the resource, 2) a host with which the resource resides, and 3) the name of the resource presented in the form of a path. For example, http://soft.yesky.com/lesson/148/2623648.shtml is a domain name, wherein "http://" indicates that the mechanism for nominating is according to HTML 4.0 specification, "soft.yesky.com indicates the host, and "/lesson/148/2623648.shtml" indicates the path for accessing the content resource. Therefore, the Low et al. content code, which is to be converted to a URI that is used to identify a content resource, is distinct from the full digital code address required by claim 1, which is used to identify an online computer.

Kelly is relied on as suggesting a number being specified by a country or area. Claim 1 is revised to require an online number comprising a digital number of an established network site, which is predetermined by a country or area. Kelly fails to disclose or suggest such an online number as required by claim 1. Instead, Kelly discusses a method for translating a domain name representing a telephone number into a network protocol address of a gateway server (see Kelly, col. 3, lines 56-57). In Kelly, a country code or area code of a telephone number is used to identify a PSTN end user and thus help locate an appropriate gateway server. Kelly is silent as to a digital number of an established network site, which is predetermined by a country or area, as required by claim 1 and therefore is distinct from the invention of claim 1.

For at least these reasons above, claim 1 is patentable over Low et al. in view of Kelly. Claims 6, 7 and 8-17 depend from claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

New claim 18 is patentable over Low et al. in view of Kelly for reasons similar to those discussed above. In addition, claim 18 requires assigning the FDCA allowing the online computers in the network to identify each other via the network. Nothing in the reference disclosures teaches or suggests assigning an FDCA code as required by claim 18. For at least these reasons, claim 18 is patentable.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, James A. Larson, Reg. No. 40,443, at (612) 455-3805.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: March 5, 2007

By: _____
James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443

JAL:cy